

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
11 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

12 CURTIS J. WILLIAMS,

13 Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-05-0164 DFL PAN P

14 vs.

15 R.W. SANDHAM, et al.,

16 Defendants.

ORDER

17 _____/
18 On July 7, 2006, plaintiff filed two motions to compel further discovery responses
19 from defendant Steen. These motions were mailed on July 4, 2006. However, pursuant to this
20 court's January 6, 2006 scheduling order, discovery closed April 28, 2006.¹ Accordingly,
21 plaintiff's motions are untimely and will be denied.

22 /////

23 /////

24 _____
25 ¹ On April 26, 2006, the discovery deadline was extended only for defendant Mangis, who
26 was ordered served in this action on February 9, 2006. Defendant Steen filed an answer on August 8, 2005.

1 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's July 7, 2006 motions to compel are
2 denied. (Docket Nos. 58 and 59.)

3 DATED: July 27, 2006.

4
5 
6 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

7 /001; will0164.mtc2
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26